

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 51 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 16, 21, 31, 26, 32, 37, 42, 45 and 48 to 51 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 4, 7 to 16, 18 to 26, 28 to 32, 34 to 37 and 39 to 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,669,040 (Hisatake) and U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135 (Webb). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hisatake and Webb as applied to Claims 1 and 4, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,013 (Ota). Claims 6, 17, 27, 33 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hisatake and Webb as applied to Claims 1, 16, 26, 32 and 37, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,706,411 (McCormick). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns using printing and copying functions. When a copy type function (included in a plurality of image processing functions) is performing a print type function, an information processing apparatus displays information indicating the copy type function is being executed and information showing that the print type function cannot be executed.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a print system which includes an image processing apparatus for executing an image processing function selected from among a plurality of image processing functions, wherein the image processing apparatus has a print function; and an information processing apparatus for generating print data to be transferred to the image processing apparatus. The information processing apparatus acquires, from the image processing apparatus, information indicating the function status of the plurality of image processing functions, also executes a process of transferring the

generated print data to the image processing apparatus and displays the function status of the plurality of image processing functions on a display unit based on the acquired information.

When a copy function included in the plurality of image processing functions obtains the print function, the information processing apparatus displays information indicating that the copy function is being executed and information showing that the print function based on the generated print data cannot be executed.

In contrast, Hisatake shows sharing a printer engine among print, fax and copy jobs. (See Figures 7 to 14 of Hisatke.) In Hisatke, the print job is made to wait while the copy job is being executed. In addition, Hisatake shows that the copy job is displayed on an operation panel. This operation panel is provided as a local operation panel. However, Hisatake fails to disclose or suggest an information processing apparatus acquiring from an image processing apparatus information indicating a function status and displaying the function status of the plurality of image processing functions on a display unit based on the acquired information wherein the information processing apparatus also executes a process of transferring generated print data to the image processing apparatus.

In addition, the status information of Hisatake is based on the status of jobs and not of functions. That is, Claim 1 features information indicating the function status of a plurality of image processing functions. Furthermore, Claim 1 features that, when a copy function included in the plurality of image processing functions obtains the print function, the information processing apparatus displays information indicating that the copy function is being executed and information showing that the print function based on generated print data cannot be executed. These features are neither disclosed or suggested by Hisatake, as Hisatake operates only on job data and on function data.

Finally, Webb discloses using bidirectional communications between a host computer and a selected printer to create a visual and functional replica of an operator panel for the selected printer on the host computer. However, modification of the image forming apparatus of Hisatake with the replica of an operator panel of Webb will not cure the deficiencies of Hisatake. Namely, Webb fails to disclose or suggest an information processing apparatus capable of acquiring from an image processing apparatus information indicating a function status, displaying the function status of the plurality of image processing functions and transferring generated print data to the image processing apparatus. Furthermore, Webb fails to disclose or suggest information indicating the function status of a plurality of image processing functions such that, when a copy function included in the plurality of image processing functions obtains the print function, the information processing apparatus displays information indicating that the copy function is being executed and information showing that the print function based on generated print data cannot be executed.

As discussed above, Hisatake, either taken alone or in combination with Webb, cannot teach or suggest transmitting from the image processing apparatus to the information processing apparatus information indicating that a certain image processing function cannot be executed in a predetermined condition.

In light of the deficiencies of Hisatake and Webb as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 11, 16, 42, and 45 are directed to apparatuses which include features similar to the features of Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that the discussion from above in regard to Claim 1 applies equally to Claims 11, 16, 42, and 45. Accordingly, Applicant

submits that Claims 11, 16, 42, and 45 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 21, 26, 48 and 49 are method claims corresponding to apparatus Claims 11, 16, 42 and 45, respectively. Claims 31 and 32 are directed to programs stored on a computer-readable medium corresponding to apparatus Claims 11 and 16, respectively. Claims 37, 50 and 51 are directed to computer-readable mediums storing a program corresponding to Claims 16, 42 and 45, respectively. As such, Applicant submits that Claims 21, 26, 31, 32, 37, 48, 49, 50 and 51 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the allowability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at
(714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frank L. Cire', written over a horizontal line.

Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 109739v1